APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,756	02/09/2004	James E. King	5681-85500	6139

58467   7590   11/07/2008
MHKKG/SUN
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767

EXAMINER
SIDDIQI, MOHAMMAD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/07/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08/01/2008*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-14 are presented for examination. Claim 14 is new.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Autor et. al. (US 2003/0065751) (Hereinafter Autor) in view of Richards et al. (US

2003/0097422) (Hereinafter Richards).

4.   As per claims 1 and 8, Autor discloses a modular computer system comprising

at least one service processor module and means (220, fig 2A, page 3, para #0033,

lines 1-3) and a plurality of information processing modules (elements of fig 2A, page 3

, para #0028), removably received in a modular computer system housing (page 3, para

#0026, lines 7-13), wherein the service processor module is operable in receipt of a

naming command message from an external management entity module (server

administrator communicates with server 220 to enter rack name in fig 2A, page 3, para #0033, lines 1-8) to assign a name to each service processor module (propagate, page 3, para #0033) and each information processing module according to a format (ASCII word format page 3, para #0031, line 3 and para #0033, propagate) specified in the naming command message (server administrator communicates with server 220 to enter rack name in fig 2A, page 3, para #0033, lines 1-8). Autor further discloses naming of server racks located in datacenters, further teaches storing rack name on individual server and sharing the rack name with other servers, and also teaches web servers part of the rack which anticipates pre-determined IP address. Autor fails to specifically recite each processing module having a predetermined IP address, and to transmit a message to an external domain name server indicating the IP address of each service processor module and each information processing module and the name assigned to each respective module. However, Richards disclosed each processing module having a predetermined IP address (remotely configuring, provisioning and deploying center, page 1, para #0016; page 2, para #0036), and to transmit a message to an external domain name server (page 3, para #0046-#0048) indicating the IP address of each service processor module (remotely configuring, provisioning and deploying center, page 3, para #0040-#0051) and each information processing module and the name assigned to each respective module (remotely configuring, provisioning and discovery process, page 3, para #0040-#0052). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the invention is made to incorporate the teachings of Richards into Autor, such that remotely configuring and provisioning server

racks located in datacenters and located in different geographical regions utilizing

available utilities such as:

 DNS: A system for converting host names and domain names into IP addresses on the

Internet or on local networks that use the TCP/IP protocol.

 DHCP: Software that automatically assigns temporary IP addresses to client stations

logging onto an IP network. It eliminates having to manually assign permanent "static"

IP addresses. DHCP software runs in servers and router.

PXE: An Intel Wired for Management (WfM) capability that enables a PC to boot from

the server. It enables remote booting (boot the OS), remote emergency booting (boot a

diagnostic program) and remote new system startup (boot the installation program to

install the OS). PXE is supported in the BIOS.

TFTP: is an Internet software utility for transferring files that is simpler to use than the

File Transfer Protocol.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to configure and

provision rack and rack mounted servers located in data centers utilizing commercially,

off-the-shelf available utilities as described in the prior art of Richards in a manner

analogous to prior art of Autor because it provides capability of remotely configuring,

deploying, and provisioning rack mounted .

5.   As per claim 2, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In

addition Richards discloses wherein the naming format includes at least one of a

geographical location identifier part (country, page 3, para #0041), a housing identifier

part (rack, page 3, para #0041) and a module identifier part (Host name, page 3, para #0048).

6.   As per claim 3, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition Richards discloses wherein the external management entity (2, fig 2, page 2, para #0036) provides data describing at least one of the geographical location identifier part (country, page 3,para #0041) and the housing identifier part to the service processor module (rack, page 3,para #0041-#0048).

7.   As per claim 4, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition Autor discloses wherein the service processor

module creates at least the module identifier part (propagate, page 4, para #0041).

8.   As per claim 5, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition Autor discloses wherein the service processor (220, fig 2A, page 3, para #0033, lines 1-3) module is operable to assign a name to each service processor module and each information processing module received in at least one further modular computer system housing according to the format specified in the naming command message (propagate, 220, fig 2A, page 3, para #0033).

9.   As per claim 6, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In addition Autor discloses wherein the at least one further

modular computer system housing is located in the same geographical location as the

modular computer system (100, fig 2A, Page 3, #0028).

10.   As per claim 7, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above. In

addition Autor discloses wherein the at least one further

modular computer system housing is located in the same computer racking system as

the modular computer system (100, fig 2A, Page 3, #0028).

11.   As per claim 9, Autor discloses a method of distributing names to components of

a networked computer system including at least one modular computer system having

at least one service processor module (220, fig 2A, page 3, para #0033) and a plurality

of information processing modules removably received in a modular computer system

housing (page 3, para #0026, lines 7-13), the method comprising:

generating a naming command message at a management entity of the networked

computer system (ASCII word format page 3, para #0031, line 3 and para #0033, A

server administrator);

transmitting the naming command message to the service processor module(ASCII

word format page 3, para #0031, line 3 and para #0033, service administrator enter the

rack name); the service processor assigning a name to itself and to the information

processing modules received in the housing in accordance with a format set out in the

naming command message (ASCII word format page 3, para #0031, line 3 and para

#0033, propagate). Autor fails to specifically transmitting a message to a domain name

server of the networked computer system, the message including an IP address of each

module and the name assigned to each respective module. However, Richards

discloses transmitting a message to a domain name server of the networked computer

system (page 3, para #0046-#0048), the message including an IP address of each

module and the name assigned to each respective module (remotely configuring,

provisioning and Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at

the invention is made to incorporate the teachings of Richards into Autor, such that

remotely configuring and provisioning server racks located in datacenters located in

different geographical regions utilizing available utilities such as:

 DNS: A system for converting host names and domain names into IP addresses on the

Internet or on local networks that use the TCP/IP protocol.

 DHCP: Software that automatically assigns temporary IP addresses to client stations

logging onto an IP network. It eliminates having to manually assign permanent "static"

IP addresses. DHCP software runs in servers and router.

PXE: An Intel Wired for Management (WfM) capability that enables a PC to boot from

the server. It enables remote booting (boot the OS), remote emergency booting (boot a

diagnostic program) and remote new system startup (boot the installation program to

install the OS). PXE is supported in the BIOS.

TFTP: is an Internet software utility for transferring files that is simpler to use than the

File Transfer Protocol.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to configure and

provision rack and rack mounted servers located in data centers utilizing commercially,

off-the-shelf available utilities as described in the prior art of Richards in a manner

analogous to prior art of Autor because it provides capability of remotely configuring,

deploying, and provisioning rack mounted servers via internet.

12.   As per claim 10, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9, above. In

addition, Richards discloses wherein the naming format includes at least one of a

geographical location identifier part (country, page 3, para #0041), a housing identifier

part (page 3, para #0041) and a module identifier part module (rack, page 3, para

#0041-#0048).

13.   As per claim 11, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9, above. In

addition, Autor discloses further comprising the service processor assigning a name to a

service processor module (propagate, 220, fig 2A, page 3, para #0033) and information

processing modules removably (page 3, para #0026, lines 7-13) received in a further

modular computer system housing of the networked computer system (propagate, 220,

fig 2A, page 3, para #0033).

14.   As per claim 12, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9, above. In

addition, Autor discloses wherein the further modular computer system housing is co-

located with the modular computer system (100, fig 2A, Page 3, #0028).

15.   As per claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 1, above.

14. As per claim 14, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9, above. In

addition, Autor discloses the service processor is further operable to generate the name

assigned of each respective module based on the format specified in the naming

command message (server administrator communicates with server 220 to enter rack

name in fig 2A, page 3, para #0033, lines 1-8).

Response to Arguments

16.   Applicant's arguments filed 08/01/2008 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive, therefore rejections to claims 1-13 is maintained.

17.   In response to Applicant's arguments **against the references individually**, one

cannot show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller,* 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ

871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In this case Autor discloses the service processor module is operable in receipt of a

naming command message from an external management entity module (server

administrator communicates with server 220 to enter rack name in fig 2A, page 3, para

#0033, lines 1-8) to assign a name to each service processor module (propagate, page

3, para #0033) and each information processing module according to a format (ASCII

word format page 3, para #0031, line 3 and para #0033, propagate) specified in the

naming command message (server administrator communicates with server 220 to

enter rack name in fig 2A, page 3, para #0033, lines 1-8). Richards disclosed each

processing module having a predetermined IP address (remotely configuring,

provisioning and deploying center, page 1, para #0016; page 2, para #0036), and to

transmit a message to an external domain name server (page 3, para #0046-#0048)

indicating the IP address of each service processor module (remotely configuring,

provisioning and deploying center, page 3, para #0040-#0051) and each information

processing module and the name assigned to each respective module (remotely

configuring, provisioning and discovery process, page 3, para #0040-#0052). Therefore,

it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the invention is made to

incorporate the teachings of Richards into Autor, such that remotely configuring and

provisioning server racks located in datacenters and located in different geographical

regions utilizing available utilities such as: DNS: A system for converting host names

and domain names into IP addresses on the Internet or on local networks that use the

TCP/IP protocol. DHCP: Software that automatically assigns temporary IP addresses to

client stations logging onto an IP network. It eliminates having to manually assign

permanent "static" IP addresses. DHCP software runs in servers and router.

PXE: An Intel Wired for Management (WfM) capability that enables a PC to boot from

the server. It enables remote booting (boot the OS), remote emergency booting (boot a

diagnostic program) and remote new system startup (boot the installation program to

install the OS). PXE is supported in the BIOS. TFTP: is an Internet software utility for

transferring files that is simpler to use than the File Transfer Protocol. One of ordinary

skill in the art would have been motivated to configure and provision rack and rack

mounted servers located in data centers utilizing commercially, off-the-shelf available

utilities as described in the prior art of Richards in a manner analogous to prior art of

Autor because it provides capability of remotely configuring, deploying, and provisioning

rack mounted.

Conclusion

18.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MOHAMMAD A. SIDDIQI whose telephone number is

(571)272-3976. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MS
/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454